

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed February 6, 2004, which replaces the Office Action mailed December 12, 2003. In the Office Action, claims 1-24 and 49 were rejected. With this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 2-13 and 23, canceled claims 25-48 and added new claims 50-54. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS - 37 C.F.R. §1.83

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to show the features described in claims 3, 9 and 11. With this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 3, 9 and 11 and believes that each of the features described therein are shown or described in a manner that satisfies 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objections be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. §102

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Zamojdo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,431). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited reference.

The present application is directed to a display (such as 22) on a mobile body (such as 124) of stored objects in a conformal manner. The stored objects correspond to object information contained in a data storage system (such as database 16). The "stored objects" correspond to real world stationary landmarks and objects, such as road elements (e.g., lane boundaries, lane barriers, lane stripes, etc.), street signs, and other landmarks [page 4, lines 16-19]. The "object information

contained in a data storage system" defines the precise geographic locations of the landmarks corresponding to the stored objects [page 8, lines 12-18; page 10, lines 12-28]. Accordingly, the "stored objects" are different from sensed objects that are detected by radar or other means [page 11, line 16 through page 12, line 4; FIG. 3F]. The term "conformal" means that the displayed or "virtual" images of the stored objects are presented by the display in a fashion such that they are substantially aligned with the real world objects that would be seen by a user having an unobstructed field of view [page 29, lines 10-16].

FIG. 3E provides an example of such a conformal display. In FIG. 3E stored objects, corresponding to right, left and center lane boundary object information contained in a data storage system, are displayed on the display as bright lines (such as shown in FIG. 3D) that are superimposed over the corresponding real world right, left, and center lane boundaries of the road on which the vehicle is traveling.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's finding that items 15-16 and 621 of FIG. 3 of Zamojdo et al. illustrate the conformal display described in claim 1 of the present application. Instead, Zamojdo et al. provide a head-up display that presents an image that appears to be "substantially parallel to the ground traversed and high above it" [Col. 2, lines 31-40] Accordingly, rather than being conformal to real world objects as viewed from the perspective of the user, the display of Zamojdo et al. is perceived as being "suspended high above the ground" [Col. 2, lines 48-54] This is illustrated in FIG. 3 of Zamojdo et al. where the displayed map on windshield 16 includes a road and a town of "Closeville" that are not displayed in a conformal manner or, in other words, aligned with the corresponding real road or town of "Closeville", as viewed from the perspective of the user. Instead, they are positioned high above the real road and town. Additionally, the cited arrow 621

has no corresponding real world object onto which it can be displayed in a conformal manner.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the display of independent claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant submits that claims 2, 5, 6 and 8 are allowable as being dependent from allowable base claim 1, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. §103

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 13 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. in view of Groves et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,414,439). In light of the discussion above, Applicant submits that claims 7, 13, 16-18 are allowable as being dependent from allowable base claim 1, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-4, 22-24 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. in view of Lemelson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,389 B1). In light of the discussion above, Applicant respectfully believes that claims 3-4, 22-24 and 49 are allowable as being dependent from allowable base claim 1, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In Section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. and further in view of Sumiyoshi (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,358). Applicant respectfully believes that claims 9 and 11 are allowable since they depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner

rejected claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. and Sumiyoshi, and further in view of Regan (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,934 B1). Applicant believes that claims 10 and 12 are presently in condition for allowance since they depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In Section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14-15 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zamojdo et al. and Groves et al. and further in view of Lemelson et al. In light of the discussion above, Applicant respectfully believes that claims 14-15 and 19-21 are allowable as being dependent from allowable base claim 1, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS

With this Amendment, Applicant has added new claims 50-54, which are directed to a mobile assist device. Applicant submits that claims 50-54 are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 50-54 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/djb